



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/761,756	01/18/2001	Hiroshi Yoshida	FUR0014-US	6156
28970	7590	04/21/2005	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP 1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD MCLEAN, VA 22102				TRAN, TONGOC
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
				2134

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/761,756	YOSHIDA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tongoc Tran	2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4, 6-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 5 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on 12/7/2004.
Claims 1-17 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/7/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends that the cited prior art, Teper et al. does not teach an access ticket for enabling access to a particular service provided by a website is transmitted to the user terminal device from the verification device. Rather, Teper teaches the access ticket is sent to the service providing website. Examiner agrees with Applicant's argument. However, as cited in the previous office action, Chin et al. teach that an access ticket based on unique security characteristic information of the device and the user identifying information is generated and forwarded to the user. After the access ticket information is verified, the user is authenticated and be able to continue executing a program, accessing files and so forth. (see Chin, col. 5, lines 12-33).

Applicant's argument with respect to claim 5 has been fully considered and is persuasive. Therefore, rejection for claim 5 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2134

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 6-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teper et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,815,665) in view of Shin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,134).

In respect to claim 1, Teper discloses a service providing system comprising terminal devices capable of communicating one another through a network, a user verification device, and a service providing device including at least one service providing web, wherein each of the terminal devices comprises (see Teper, Fig. 1); verifying information transmission means for transmitting information for verification to the user verification device, and service requesting means for requesting a service to the service providing web with an access ticket obtained from the user verification device (see Teper, col. 3, lines 19-45), and wherein the user verification device comprises;

user verification means for judging whether or not user of a terminal device is a registrant upon receipt of the information for verification (see Teper, col. 2, line 57-col. 3, line 30), and

access ticket issuing means for transmitting an access ticket for accessing a service providing web upon receipt of designation of a desired service providing web when the user verification means judges that the user of the terminal is a registrant (see Teper, col. 3, lines 5-45), and

the information for verification is transmitted by the verifying information transmission means of the terminal device, the user verification means of the user verification device judges whether or not the user of the terminal device is a registrant in accordance with the information for verification, and the access ticket for the service providing web is transmitted when the user is a registrant (see Teper, col. 2, line 57-col. 3, line 45),

wherein the service providing web comprises;
access ticket judging means for judging whether or not a request for service accompanies the access ticket from user verification means, and service providing means for providing a service to the terminal device when the access ticket judging means judges that the request for service accompanies the access ticket, and wherein following procedure is performed when the terminal device receives the service from the service providing web (see Teper, col. 3, lines 5-45);

Teper does not disclose the service requesting means of the terminal device requests the service to the service providing web with the access ticket, and the service providing web provides the service after confirming accompany of the access ticket. However, Chin discloses a user requesting service using an access ticket. When information generated from the access ticket is verified, user is allowed to access the protected resource (see Shin, col. 1, lines 10-24 and col_ 5, lines 11-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Teper's a verification device that authenticate the user and notifying the service provider after successfully authenticate the user with Chin's

teaching of issuing access ticket directly to the user in order for the user to be permit to use protected resource if the access ticket is verified for the benefit of the service providers free from inconveniences caused by handling of large amount of information (see Chin, col. 2, lines 20-30).

In respect to claim 3, Teper and Chin disclose the service providing system of claim 2, wherein the user verification device manages the information for verification for each of the service providing webs and controls issuance of the access ticket related to each of the service providing webs (see Teper, col. 3, lines 5-45).

In respect to claim 4, Teper and Chin disclose the service providing system of claim 2, wherein the user verification device manages common information for verification in relation to a plurality of service providing webs and controls issuance of the access ticket related to each of the service providing webs (see Teper, col. 3, lines 5-45).

In respect to claim 6, Teper and Chin disclose the service providing system of claim 2, the system further comprising:

a charge-processing device for performing charge-processing to the user upon receipt of log information for charging a service charge,
wherein the service providing web transmits the log information to the chargeprocessing device when a request for service accompanying the access ticket is received (see Teper, col. 3, lines 31-45).

In respect to claim 7, Teper and Chin disclose the service providing system of claim 2, wherein the user verification device comprises a user-oriented recording part

for storing service providing webs capable of being accessed by each user, and wherein the user verification device generates a user-oriented menu in accordance with content recorded in the user-oriented recording part when the user verification means judges that user is a registrant and transmits the menu to the terminal device (see Teper, col. 3, line 19-30 and col. 4, lines 15-27).

In respect to claim 8, Teper and Chin disclose the service providing system of claim 2, wherein the user verification device and the charge-processing device are composed of one computer (see Teper, Fig. 4, item 60 and col. 3, lines 31-45).

In respect to claim 9, the claim limitation is substantially similar to claim 1. Therefore, claim 9 is rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 2, 9, 14 and 16-17, the claim limitation is substantially similar to claim 1. Therefore, claim 2, 9, 14 and 16-17 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 10-13 and 15, the claim limitations are substantially similar to claims 3-7. Therefore, claims 10-13 and 15 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Neither Teper nor Chin explicitly discloses the limitation of "a charge-processing device for performing charge-processing to the user upon receipt of log information for charging a service charge, wherein the user verification device transmit the log information to the charge-processing device in response to issuance of the access ticket" as illustrated in steps s603, 604, s505, s605, s606 and s701 of Fig. 9 in Applicant's drawing.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tongoc Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3843. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 2134

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (571) 272-3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner: Tongoc Tran
Art Unit: 2134

TT


April 14, 2005

ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER